

**REMARKS**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52, and 53. By the present paper, Applicant hereby adds claims 54-102 and cancels claims 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52, and 53 without prejudice. These new claims clarify certain features to expedite allowance of the present application. As discussed below, these new claims are clearly patentable over the cited references. In light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-46, 48, 50, 52, and 53 in view of various alternative references, including Hill, III (U.S. Patent No. 5,646,819), Chang (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,817), Wicks (U.S. Patent No. 5,673,169), and Armitage et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,082). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. However, in view of the cancellation of these claims, the Applicant submits that these rejections are moot and must be withdrawn. Moreover, the new claims each recite features missing from the cited references, as discussed in further detail below.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 24-27, and 39-42 under Section 103 as obvious over Hill in view of Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 5,331,509); the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-20, 46, 48, and 50 under Section 103 as obvious over Chang, Wicks, or Armitage et al. each taken alone; the Examiner rejected claims 19, 43, and 53 under Section 103 as obvious over either Hill, or Chang, or Wicks, or Armitage each taken with Lochridge (U.S. Patent No. 5,610,798); and the Examiner rejected claims 18 and 32 under Section 103 as obvious over either Hill, or Chang, or Wicks, or Armitage each taken with Goodrich (U.S. Patent No. 5,375,076). Again,

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. However, in view of the cancellation of these claims, the Applicant submits that these rejections are moot and must be withdrawn. Moreover, the new claims each recite features missing from the cited references taken alone or in combination, as discussed in further detail below.

**New Claims 54-102**

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 54-102 each recite features missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

For example, independent claim 54 recites, *inter alia*, “a computer housing consisting essentially of a single enclosure having a generally flat panel shape and an integral wall mount.” The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features among other claim features recited in claim 54. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

By further example, independent claim 67 recites, *inter alia*, “a flat panel computer, comprising: an integrated assembly of a personal computer and a display screen enclosed entirely within a single flat panel housing.” In addition, independent claim 67 recites, *inter alia*, “a direct wall mount having at least one mounting structure integrated with the single flat panel housing; and a desktop mount comprising at least one leg integrated with the single flat panel housing.” Again, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features among other claim features recited in claim 67. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Turning to independent claim 82, this new claim recites, *inter alia*, “an *all-in-one* personal computer including a liquid crystal display, a processor, memory, and associated internal computer components *integrally assembled* within *only one* rectangular panel shaped housing.” In addition, independent claim 82 recites, *inter alia*, “a plurality of *wall mounting slots* disposed in a *rear wall* of the one rectangular panel shaped housing.” The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features among other claim features recited in claim 82. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

By further example, independent claim 87 recites, *inter alia*, “an *all-in-one* computer having an *integral* display, comprising: a *single* panel shaped housing that encloses an *integrated* assembly of *internal* components of a personal computer and a liquid crystal display.” Claim 87 further recites, *inter alia*, “at least one portion of a *direct* wall mount *integrally* disposed on a *rear wall* of the single panel shaped housing, wherein the direct wall mount is configured to substantially *fix* the single panel shaped housing to a wall in a *non-mobile* mounting configuration.” The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features among other claim features recited in claim 87. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Independent claim 98 recites “a personal computer having an *integral* flat panel display screen disposed in a *single* housing, wherein the single housing *consists essentially of* a form factor of a flat panel display housing; and a *direct* wall mount *integrally* disposed in the single housing, wherein the direct wall mount is configured to secure the single housing to a wall in a stationary configuration *without a cabinet*. The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features

among other claim features recited in claim 98. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Independent claim 99 recites “a *standalone* flat panel display having a personal computer *integrated* *therein*; and a wall *hanging* mechanism *integrated* in the standalone flat panel display.” The cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach the foregoing claim features among other claim features recited in claim 99. In addition, the dependent claims recite a variety of features clearly missing from the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Turning to the previously cited references, the Applicant submits that each of these references is missing at least one element recited in the foregoing claims. For example, Wicks and Chang both disclose *multiple* housings in which the computer is clearly *separate* from the display. Specifically, Wicks discloses *three* separate housings, including a display 10 hingedly coupled to a computer 14 and a keyboard 24 hingedly coupled to the computer 14. *See* Wicks, Fig. 6. Similarly, Chang discloses *two* separate housings, including a display 16 and a computer 10 separately housed and movably coupled via a mechanical slipping apparatus 19. *See* Chang, Figs. 1A, 1B, and 1C. In view of these missing features, the Applicant stresses that the foregoing claims are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Wicks or Chang.

Regarding the other references, Hill is clearly missing a *direct* wall mount, or a wall mount *integrated* with the computer, or a wall mount *coupled* to the computer. Instead, Hill utilizes a preexisting kitchen *cabinet*. *See* Hill, Figs. 1 and 2; col. 1, lines 23-44; col. 4, lines 6-12. This kitchen cabinet merely *receives* the computer. *See id.* There is clearly no *integration or coupling* of the wall mount with the computer. *See id.*

In view of these missing features, the Applicant stresses that the foregoing claims are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Hill.

The Armitage and Lochridge references are also deficient at least for these reasons pertaining to the Hill reference. For example, Armitage discloses a *separate* cabinet to *receive* the computer. Again, there is clearly no integration or coupling of the cabinet with the computer. In view of these missing features, the Applicant stresses that the foregoing claims are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of Armitage. By further example, Lochridge discloses *separate* angle bars 40 having keyhole openings 46, which are clearly *separate and distinct* from the personal computer housing 10. *See* Lochridge, Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 63-67; col. 5, lines 1-14. Moreover, these angle bars 40 are only configured to mount the personal computer housing 10 to a *horizontal* shelf or the like (*not a wall or vertical surface*). *See id.* As a result, even if combined with the other references as suggested by the Examiner, a combination of Lochridge with any of the other references would fail to teach or suggest a *wall* mount, or an *integral* wall mount, or *slots in the rear wall* of the computer. Again, in view of these missing features, the Applicant stresses that the foregoing claims are not obvious in view of Lochridge taken together with any of the other cited references.

In addition to these deficiencies, the Applicant also stresses that the cited references cannot be combined to render the foregoing claims obvious. For example, the Hill reference cannot be modified or combined with another reference to mount a computer *without a cabinet*, such as a kitchen cabinet. The entire focus of Hill is directed to a *kitchen* environment and use of a preexisting kitchen *cabinet*. *See* Hill, Figs. 1 and 2; col. 1, lines 23-44; col. 4, lines 6-12. In this manner, the Hill reference *teaches away* from a *direct* wall mount, an *integral* wall mount, *mounting slots* in the computer, and so

forth. Therefore, it would be improper to combine the Hill reference with any sort of direct wall mount, integral wall mount, or mounting slots.

In addition, the Examiner has failed to provide object evidence of a reason to combine the *separate* angle bars 40 having keyhole openings 46 of Lochridge with the other cited references. As noted above, these bars 40 and keyhole openings 46 are disclosed only for *horizontal* mounting, and they are clearly *separate and distinct* from the personal computer housing 10. *See* Lochridge, Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 63-67; col. 5, lines 1-14. There is simply no reason to combine these slots with the other cited references as suggested by the Examiner. As a result, the Lochridge reference cannot obviate the deficiencies of the other cited references.

For these reasons among others, the Applicant submits that the foregoing new claims 54-102 are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 09/832,387  
Request for Continued Examination (RCE)  
and Amendment and Response to  
Final Office Action mailed March 1, 2005  
Page 16

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims should be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner believes certain amendments are necessary to clarify the present claims or if the Examiner wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Date: June 1, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tait R. Swanson  
Registration No. 48,226  
(281) 970-4545

**Correspondence Address:**

Hewlett-Packard Company  
IP Administration  
Legal Department, M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400